

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER LEE CARD,

Plaintiff,

v.

JASON CHIN, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-05760-AMO](#) (PR)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Re: Dkt. No. 11

This is a closed case, which was initially filed by Plaintiff Christopher Lee Card. Before the Court is Card's pending motion for reconsideration in this closed matter. Dkt. 11.

Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides for reconsideration only upon a showing of: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered before the court's decision; (3) fraud by the adverse party; (4) the judgment is void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied; or (6) any other reason justifying relief. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). Subparagraph (6) requires a showing that the grounds justifying relief are extraordinary; mere dissatisfaction with the court's order or belief that the court is wrong in its decision are not adequate grounds for relief. *See Twentieth Century - Fox Film Corp. v. Dunnahoo*, 637 F.2d 1338, 1341 (9th Cir. 1981).

Here, Card does not make a showing of mistake, inadvertence, surprise or excusable neglect. He does not set forth any newly discovered evidence, fraud, or any grounds for finding that the judgment is void or has been satisfied. Nor does he set forth any other reason justifying relief. Instead, Card is arguing that the decision of the Court was wrong. Dkt. 11 at 16. Specifically, he challenges the Court's dismissal of his claims against the following Defendants: Judge Chin; Alameda County Deputy District Attorney Ikuma; Alameda County Public Defenders

1 Ra and Valentine; and Alameda County Psychologists Drs. Watt and Griffith. *Id.* While such
2 arguments may be properly advanced on appeal, they are not a basis for reconsideration. *See*
3 *Morse-Starrett Products Co. v. Steccone*, 205 F.2d 244, 249 (9th Cir. 1953) (finding that “[t]he
4 procedure provided by rule 60(b) is not a substitute for an appeal”). Thus, there is no reason to
5 warrant reconsideration. His motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**. Dkt. 11.

6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7 Dated: August 20, 2025

8
9 

10 **ARACELI MARTÍNEZ-OLGUÍN**
11 **United States District Judge**

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California